

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18831

Democratic Senator, both of whom have voiced their objections to this program. But since politics governs, the voices of your representatives in Washington are drowned out by the loud cries of the highly vocal and well heeled opposition—the coal mine owners spend over \$2 million each year on their Washington operations aimed at perpetuating this outrage. The vocal, selfish, dishonest few can always conquer the silent, honest majority. This leads me to the main purpose of my visit to Maine. I want to alert this audience to the fact that Maine industry cannot afford to continue to pay homage to the coal industry and somehow the residents of Maine must be made aware of this fact and awakened out of their lethargy into action.

What are the facts? Imported residual fuel oil has merely supplemented but never supplanted domestic production of this product. Imported residual fuel oil is not the cause of the coal industry's troubles—I repeat, residual fuel oil is not the cause of the coal industry's troubles.

Imported residual fuel oil is essential for the economic production of power, both utilities and commercial industrial consumers, in the State of Maine since you have no indigenous supplies other than that of hydroelectric power. The present program of controlling an economically unjustified system of restricting the importation of this low cost energy has eliminated competition by creating a form of monopoly cartel with the consumer tied to one supplier. Any system involving quota import allocations is unfair and inequitable since an import license is a blank check for the lucky importer who can then bulldoze his captive consumers into submission. This program is no exception and the Maine consumer is paying millions in tribute to the coal mine owners each year. Under the present quota system prices have no relation to economic factors since the method of cutting the import allocation pie is the final decisive price factor.

What can you do about the problem since you have the biggest stake in this issue?

It is a political issue and until the grass-roots rise up in honest wrath and make known their views in Washington nothing will happen. The loud voice of the voter is the deciding factor and the group that squeaks the most gets the most grease. You cannot expect your representatives in Washington to do this job alone—they must have your help in this fight. The President and his administrative staff are well aware of the facts of the case but it is up to you consumers, and every one of us is a consumer of power that contains an incremental excess charge due to these import restrictions, to give the administration the power and incentive to act on behalf of the interests of all consumers.

The association with which I am connected, the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, has been fighting virtually alone to get relief for its members since they cannot continue to survive in the marketplace under the present program. We have blunted our sword in our efforts to get controls removed. An objective evaluation of the scene has forced us to admit to ourselves that since the consumer is always the last to be heard from and galvanized into action, we had better fall back and start a different mode of attack that will take into account the political realities of life. By this I mean that we are now going to concentrate on a compromise that is attainable; namely, the changing of the ground rules of import regulatory controls whereby the present system of end use energy control, no consumer freedom of choice of supplier, and no competition for the consumer's business, is eliminated and replaced by a system of controls that returns competition for the energy con-

sumer's dollar to the marketplace. We want an import system that gives to the consumer the benefit of a low fuel cost via the free enterprise competitive system and this can only be accomplished by the elimination of quotas assigned to eligible importers and instead the establishment of a system whereby if a supplier gets the customer he automatically gets the right to import the residual fuel oil needed and satisfy that customer's fuel requirements. This one simple change would result in savings of several millions of dollars each year in the fuel costs of Maine consumers. It would return your fuel economy to the traditional system of a free competitive market.

Finally, what can you do to help? All of you should go on record collectively through your chapters in Maine and individually by registering your protest to your elected State and Federal representatives as well as to the President of our country. You should get all your customers and friends as well as those with whom you do business to also act accordingly. You should use every means and channel of communication to get all who have a direct or indirect vested interest in the welfare of Maine to bring political pressure to bear on the focal point of action; namely, Washington.

Finally, I'll close with a quote from a letter I received recently from A. R. Schiller, president of the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, since I hope that Maine businessmen will adopt the same policy. "You may rest assured that we shall continue in our efforts just as long as we believe that the imposition of artificial and unnecessary import restrictions continue to contribute to the fact that fuel costs in New England are the highest of any region." Unless all of you who have a direct vested interest in this issue get into this fight for the right, nothing will happen because without you, the consumer, in the battle we have lost without firing a shot.

(Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. LAIRD'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

FEED GRAIN PROGRAM OF 1963 AN INCREDIBLE WASTE

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this year taxpayers spent an alltime record amount—nearly a billion dollars—trying to persuade farmers not to grow corn. Despite this outlay, corn production will break all records.

The Department of Agriculture has announced the 1963 corn crop will reach 4,009 million bushels—also an alltime high.

The program is intended to cut back production of feed grains, of which corn is the major item. Before the program started, annual production was 152.6 million tons (average of the program's base years, 1959-60). Production this year is officially estimated at 152 million tons—down only 60,000 tons.

Expressed in corn equivalent, this means a cutback in production of only 21.4 million bushels.

Payments to farmers and other direct costs of this year's program total \$924.5 million.

Therefore, taxpayers are shelling out \$43 for each bushel cutback in production. This is a fantastic price to pay for not growing a bushel of corn worth about \$1.

In opposing the 2-year extension of this program last spring on the House floor, I predicted each bushel cutback in production this year would cost \$27. Several Congressmen tried to ridicule my estimate, but it proved to be very much on the conservative side.

We have now had 3 years experience with the feed grains program. We are spending more than ever getting less results.

This program costs taxpayers nearly one-fourth the value of the entire feed grain crop.

Last spring the Congress authorized this same billion-dollar boondoggle for 1964 and 1965. This action should be repealed, in order to prevent further repetition of this incredible waste.

DISARMAMENT

(Mr. RYAN of New York (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a significant resolution which I am sponsoring and which is being introduced today in the other body by Senator JOSEPH CLARK and 15 other Senators. I have introduced in the House this resolution which states the following:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President should be supported in his efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under legally effective controls and to develop international institutions capable of keeping the peace during and after disarmament.

Sec. 2. The President is hereby requested to formulate as speedily as possible specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States regarding the establishment of an international authority to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament effectively guaranteed by adequate inspection and controls. In formulating such proposals, the President is requested to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace, including (1) an international disarmament organization; (2) a permanent world peace force; (3) world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; (4) other international institutions necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law; and (5) appropriate and reliable financial arrangements for the support of such peacekeeping machinery, may best be achieved by revision of the Charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two.

Sec. 3. The President should make such proposals available to the Congress and to the public generally.

Sec. 4. The President is requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the heads of government of all of the nations of the world and to urge them to initiate within their governments studies of matters germane to

18832

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 17

this resolution and to formulate and make generally available recommendations based upon such studies.

Mr. Speaker, on September 25, 1961, the President in his magnificent address to the United Nations stated:

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must, contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness.

Although the test ban treaty has been signed, the President's statement is as valid today as it was in 1961. The test ban treaty is the first step toward the day when the nuclear sword of Damocles will no longer hang over our heads. However, we must realize that, although "a journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step," that journey will never be completed unless the first step is followed by many others. The road to be traveled if the world is to know peace and security is clear. It is the road toward disarmament under effective international control. As long as nations retain nuclear weapons with their capacity to destroy civilization, we will remain threatened by extinction. For, as the President so eloquently has pointed out, the danger from "accident or miscalculation or madness" will not be removed until disarmament under effective international control is achieved.

The realization that "the weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us" led to the "U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." This proposal, which was introduced in 1961 at the 16th session of the United Nations General Assembly, defined the objective of the United States as:

A world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The resolution introduced today will move us toward that goal. It is a constructive step forward toward the establishment of the only genuine security system for the United States and the world—disarmament under effective international control. I urge all my colleagues to join with me in support of this resolution.

(Mr. FARBSTAIN (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FARBSTAIN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

VOICE OF SANITY

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the recent news reports in the communications media concerning the military coups of the Morales government in Honduras and the Bosch government in the Dominican Republic indicated a

grave concern over a worsening situation in Latin America.

Our able and distinguished colleague, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, who as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs has access to the essential information to form a constructive judgment, has expressed his opinion in an excellent speech before this House on the military coups in Latin and Central America, and has shown his concern over the relationship between the United States and the new governments in Honduras and the Dominican Republic. It would be good for members of the executive branch of our Government to recognize Congressman SELDEN's opinion and carefully watch the future developments in those countries before setting policy advocating strong action against their new governments.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD, the October 11, 1963 editorial from the Evening Star that commends Congressman SELDEN's views as a "Voice of Sanity":

VOICE OF SANITY

Representative SELDEN's remarks in the House this week on coups, dictators, and democracy didn't attract much attention. This is too bad. For what he said made sense—a great deal more sense than some of the overly excited commentators who would have us believe that the end of the world is heralded by the upsets in the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

Mr. SELDEN, who comes from Alabama, is chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. In this capacity he has access to the information essential to an informed judgment.

He says there is no doubt that the best interests of the United States lie in the existence of a democratic and economically stable Latin America. But he doesn't believe that our interests would be served by dispatching gunboats and the marines to the Caribbean every time a military coup is staged. It is strange, as Mr. SELDEN points out, that so many people who recoil in horror from the prospective use of force against a Castro are eager to smash the military regime which ousted Juan Bosch in Santo Domingo. And it is also foolish.

Mr. SELDEN thinks we do not really know as yet whether the events in Santo Domingo and Honduras are not in fact serving the long-range interests of the people of those countries. And it follows that we do not really know whether our own long-range interests are being served.

Both Mr. Bosch and President Villeda Morales were guilty at least of temporizing in the face of internal Communist threats. They did not head strong governments. As Mr. SELDEN aptly put it, "democracy was doomed in the Dominican Republic and Honduras not by its strong enemies but by its weak servants."

Now that these weak regimes have been toppled, the United States must make a decision. We are suspending aid and diplomatic acceptance, presumably pending an evaluation of the intentions of the military people who have taken control. Aid and diplomacy can properly be used to obtain maximum democratic concessions from them. But they cannot bring back a Bosch or a Villeda Morales.

This being the case, is it in our interests to squeeze hard enough to induce the collapse of the existing governments? We do not think so, for the alternative would very probably be Communist governments on the Castro pattern.

Mr. SELDEN summed it up this way: "Let me put it bluntly—a dictatorship is odious. But if driven to a choice I prefer a dictator-

ship seeking our support and friendship rather than a Communist dictatorship capable of furnishing missile emplacements to those who would bury us."

This last may be a bit on the rhetorical side. But the basic thesis should appeal to anyone in his right mind.

MONTICELLO COLLEGE, ALTON, ILL.

(Mr. PRICE (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I address the House today. Tomorrow, Friday, October 18, marks the formal dedication of the new \$2 million theatron of Monticello College for Women at Godfrey, Ill. Hatheway Hall, as it is to be known, has been made possible through a private gift. The largest single donation ever received by a junior college in the United States. This building realizes the combining of facilities for cultural, academic, and athletic activities, and represents the continuing strides of Monticello in meeting the challenges of the future.

Long known as one of the outstanding 2-year colleges for women, Monticello College is in its 128th year. Founded in 1835, and known as the Monticello Female Seminary until 1935, the school has continued to expand its physical plant without impairing its reputation as an educational institution of first order. Noted for its curriculum and facility, Monticello has compiled an enviable academic record throughout its history. It is indeed fitting that Monticello College has been cited many times as a leading private educational institution.

From the original class of 16 to the present student body of 350, Monticello has been able to meet its needs solely through private enterprise. Hatheway Hall is but one more example of this, and is further indicative of Monticello College's contribution to the well-being of its students and the community.

The following article from the October 12 edition of the Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph relates the history of Monticello College:

THE MONTICELLO STORY

The first year for Hatheway Hall marks the 128th year for Monticello College. Opening Hatheway Hall is another milestone in the history of the college, providing a place for educational, cultural, and athletic events under one roof.

Monticello College, founded in 1835 as Monticello Female Seminary, is one of the oldest institutions for the higher education of women in the United States. It was founded by Capt. Benjamin Godfrey, a retired sea captain, born in Chatham, Mass., in 1794. Godfrey made a fortune in Mexico, which he lost to bandits.

He made another fortune, came to New Orleans, then to St. Louis. He settled on the prairie 4 miles north of Alton (Monticello, Ill., later Godfrey, Ill.).

Godfrey had eight daughters for whom he wished the kind of education which would make them better wives and mothers. He described the beginning of his idea for the education of women in a letter * * * "One morning while lying in my bed somewhat indisposed, my wife came into the room, and as she went out, made some comment. One of our little children, who had just begun to lisp a few words, caught the remark, and

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

early days of the Senate probe into the Pentagon's controversial TFX fighter-bomber, the Kennedy administration made no secret of its indignation at comments suggesting that political considerations determined the selection of the contractor. But by playing politics on routine contract announcements, the administration every day contributes to the public notion that influence does, indeed, swing million- and billion-dollar decisions.

Too, the system is fraught with temptation. The legislator who receives inside information on major contract awards is presented with the opportunity to benefit in the stock market; or, if he is too scrupulous for that, others he informs may not be.

Today's chief critics of the political tipoff habit, quite naturally, are Republicans. Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware warned Defense Secretary McNamara in a recent letter: "Any suggestion that is allowed to remain that Government contracts can be obtained through the enlistment of congressional intervention is both wrong and dangerous. * * * I am very fearful that unless a correction of this policy is made it will ultimately result in the development of a major scandal that could make the old 5-percent, milk coat operations look like a Sunday school picnic."

Nevertheless, it wasn't too many years ago that some Republican legislators were criticizing President Eisenhower for not making greater use of the scoop technique to help the party faithful, particularly around election time. And to some extent he did; so the Republicans are not above reproach. But what the GOP did spasmodically, the Democrats now do methodically.

The fact of the matter is that Congress, not the administration in power, is the motivating force behind the system. Mr. McNamara made the point in replying to Senator WILLIAMS. "Barring some further indication that Congress as a whole desires termination of this practice," the Defense Secretary wrote, "I am disposed to continue it."

Underlying Mr. McNamara's reply was the knowledge of a top secret conference held during the early days of the Kennedy administration. It was called by aids to several influential Democratic Congressmen; it was attended by representatives from the White House, the Pentagon, and other Federal agencies; and it was designed to firmly establish the right of Democrats on Capitol Hill to enjoy the perquisites of power by getting advance word on contract awards.

Though there's no official record of the decisions reached at that unpublicized gathering, what has evolved is a two-part operation for speeding prior notice to Capitol Hill that has all the precision of a well-planned military maneuver. The midmorning Pentagon-White House mission is a strictly partisan affair. White House aids won't talk, but it's known they pass along their exclusive data to congressional favorites as routine procedure.

A NONPARTISAN NEWS SERVICE

Thus, the favored are assured of receiving word of contracts of interest to them before noon each day. This extra-special attention to party stalwarts is an extension of a separate procedure that seeks to give politicians of both parties a smaller lead on contract news. Each of the armed services has a separate staff of congressional liaison officers that sees to it that all interested legislators, Democrats and Republicans alike, get about 1 hour's notice before public release of contract awards. The legislators are notified at 3 p.m. each day, the press at 4 p.m. The Air Force delivers its information by personal messenger to congressional offices; the Army and Navy use the telephone for the most part.

Until recently, Congress witnessed the spectacle of uniformed majors and colonels,

their watches synchronized, delivering confidential contract memos with split-second timing to avoid charges of leaking the "leaks" to one legislator ahead of another.

But this got to be a bit too much, and several Congressmen objected to the use of high-ranking soldiers as messenger boys. So the Pentagon adjusted its tactics; it now uses enlisted men to carry contract news unless a contract must be explained to a lawmaker. For these more delicate maneuvers, officers are still preferred.

The rationale offered to justify the 1-hour news break for Congressmen is to enable them to intelligently answer press queries on contracts awarded to companies in their States. There's no mention of the fact that, since the Pentagon awarded the contracts, maybe its representatives should be the ones to reply to questions. Nor is the point made that Congressmen seldom are given any more contract information than is the press, so they can't add substance to a news story anyway.

In the final analysis, then, the entire operation—both the partisan and nonpartisan phases—boils down to nothing more than political sleight-of-hand. And quite a few Pentagon officials express the private (very private) wish that the whole procedure be abandoned once and for all. This view, not surprisingly, is heard most frequently from those officers who are required to spend hours on the phone assuring non-favored Congressmen that the military was not responsible for contract leaks to their rivals. Sighs one harried diplomat-officer: "I'd much rather wrestle with the many complex problems of guided missiles than of guided leaks."

From the foregoing it can be seen that the administration not only manages the news, intimidates the news, but now it is acting like a plumber bent on sabotage. Thus is born "The Guided Leak."

A Well-Deserved Tribute to Dr. Teller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Air Force and Space Digest magazine for October editorially paid to Dr. Edward Teller the following well-deserved tribute:

THE LONELY WORLD OF EDWARD TELLER
(By William Leavitt)

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 5.—During the initial round of test ban testimony before the Senate, James Reston of the New York Times noted in one of his Washington columns that the administration, in its anxiety for quick Senate approval, had converted what was at best a grade B production into a spectacular. Mr. Reston referred to the parade of prestigious witnesses testifying on the treaty and the consequent flood of press coverage and editorializing across the land.

This display was somewhat in contrast, of course, to the President's rather conservative first report to the Nation on the treaty in which he asked for serious debate on the merits and failings of the pact and in which he warned that peace was not about to break out as a result of the treaty.

There has been a debate, of sorts, and at this writing the treaty seems heading for Senate ratification without reservations.

But out of it all has emerged a regrettable and unfair fallout—a division in the public mind of the large company of ban proponents and the small band of opponents into good guys and bad guys respectively.

Nuclear physicist Dr. Edward Teller has been cast as the chief bad guy because for himself, and for many who chose not to speak out, he articulated the military-technological risks inherent in what no one can deny was a hastily reached agreement. For his pains, a man whose record as a contributor to free world strength is unassailable has been scoffed at, harried, described as shortsighted, in some circles pictured as bloodthirsty, and, it would be hard to deny, isolated by the administration. It is disheartening to note the number of news stories portraying the physicist as thick accented, stubborn, bushy-browed, and the like. It is almost as if Dr. Teller were the archetype of a mad scientist who plots to blow up the world.

It is a peculiar and unfortunate American custom to apply black and white criteria to questions of national policy. This failing has been particularly evident in the post-test ban weeks. The treaty, which in reality cannot be described as anything more than a possible step toward the reduction of the potential problem of radioactive contamination of the atmosphere, has somehow evolved, in too much of the public mind, into a great turning point in the cold war. For example, this writer, in discussing the treaty with a knowledgeable science reporter friend, was startled to hear him declare that the reason he favored the treaty was not the fallout problem but rather his conviction that the pact really represented a first step toward the settlement of the cold war. Such a view is both naive and cynical. It is naive because it ignores the clear lessons of our past dealings with the Communists and the present realities of Communist power. It is cynical because to discount lightly the fallout question and still favor the treaty is to abandon the sole reason why anyone ought to even consider such a pact.

Dr. Teller exhibits neither naivete nor cynicism. Dr. Teller recognizes the problem of fallout, points out correctly that there is no scientific consensus on its consequences, and proposes that the nuclear powers agree to limit the amount of fallout they would pump into the atmosphere, an agreement that could be inspected in much the same way as the test ban treaty will be—by national detection systems. Such an approach, he believes, would protect the atmospheric environment, while at the same time allow us to continue needed nuclear experimentation, including the quest for clean nuclear capability.

Dr. Teller, who is the father of children he loves and who prefers that title to that of "father of the H-bomb," is no less cognizant of the dangers of fallout than any of his critics. But, at the same time, he asserts correctly that there is no absolute understanding of its genetic implications. He believes that the risks of fallout must be balanced against requirements of military security in an era of rapid technological change in which weapon breakthroughs are conceivable. Indeed, Dr. Teller has been much more consistent in his views on fallout than the Government, which has for the past several years tended to downgrade and ungrade the fallout danger in line with the policy of the period.

There ought to be no good guys-bad guys dichotomy in the test ban dialogue. Instead, there ought to be recognition of the cold fact that the only possible justification for taking the military risks involved in the test ban treaty is the hope that potential biological dangers of atmospheric pollution may be reduced—if the Russians keep to their word and refrain from aboveground testing.

A6506

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 17

Those who have openly opposed the pact—Dr. Teller, Generals Power and Schriever, and the other few—have had valid reasons for doing so. Their reasons are rooted in their responsibilities and in their jobs. As commander in chief of SAC, General Power is uniquely responsible for most of the free world's strategic strength, strength which has made nuclear aggression thus far unattractive to the Soviets. If in his judgment the treaty tends to foreclose tests of his operational missile weaponry and their launch pads, then he had no choice but to oppose. In the same way, as head of Air Force research and development, General Schriever had the same kind of responsibility. Both men did their duty as they saw it—as did Dr. Teller and the other opponents of the pact.

It is to their credit that they have had the courage to do so.

A Woman President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I recently noted cleverly written comments by Ann Maher, editor, Barbara County Index, Medicine Lodge, Kans. She asks the question, "Would a woman make a good President?" and then gives a most definitive answer.

With Congress moving at a snail's pace, it takes a real stretch of imagination to even label it a do-nothing Congress, hence Members will have adequate time between now and adjournment to enjoy her comments.

As so ably stated in an accompanying editorial:

If we are to elect men who are capable, we must know what manner of men they are. But candidates are going to have to divest themselves of all the high-flown gab and start speaking "United States."

The editorial follows:

A WOMAN PRESIDENT

With an election coming up the question arose: Would a woman make a good president? Yes, I think I would. I base this assumption on a number of things. First, I don't rattle easily. Oh, I get confused over decimal points, fractions, highway directions, and any amount of money over \$25, and to this day I can't figure out how to eat corn on the cob without getting one end of it in an ear, but this is all minor. Too, a black cloud coming up makes me babble like a brook but if I were President I'd be shut up in an office and not see black clouds. Or just be shut up.

One thing for sure, if you folks elected me President we'd have to spend money in smaller amount. Mathematical figures, especially if they contain sevens and nines, have almost ruined my life and are probably the reason I write stuff like this for a living instead of being a tycoon. If Congress asked me for \$8 billion to build a waterway through Alden, Kans., I'd tell Congress to go jump in the lake. And if a variety of Senators wanted a lot of money to rid their State of three-eyed beetles or resurface Main Street I'd poke them in the nose. I don't under-

stand figures in those amounts and I don't want them asking for anything over \$5.

There is an erroneous supposition that a woman would not be able to handle a cabinet of men. Fiddle-faddle. Anyone who can rattle a turkey at Thanksgiving, stretch a budget to pay for necessities, and still have enough for a lipstick could manage a few men. I think what I would do is hire Jayne Mansfield for my secretary and have her go to all the Cabinet meetings with me and I'll bet we'd get bills passed on anything including garters for women in the service and none of it would cost over \$5. I would also have her attend press conferences with me and the only question asked would be, "What's your phone number?"

Another matter which concerns me is that I don't golf or fish. I guess I could sit on the bank of a creek and try to catch an ordinary fish but this wouldn't look good in all the newspapers. You've got to go out on Lake Erie in a boat as big as the *Queen Elizabeth* and haul in a fish that gets its picture in the Saturday Evening Post. Frankly, folks, I'm a little scared of water. (Frankly, folks, I'm scared to death of water.) When I was a kid I use to dread Saturday night. I suppose I could plead a headache when it came time to fish but sooner or later I'd have to take a bath.

I'll have to get over my fear of planes, too. Presidents always travel by air. How would it look for me to arrive at a foreign port with all the brass there to meet me and I'd stagger out of the plane and yell for a bucket? I know I will have to learn to fly or give up this idea of being the first woman President.

Too, Presidents have to sit through a lot of speeches at banquets in foreign countries and all the languages I know are some pig Latin, a couple of German phrases that aren't too nice, and some snappy slang. I have a tendency to put my head down in the creamed peas and doze when I don't know what's going on and if I have to sit there too long I'll take a nap. It might cause an international crisis.

But, there it is folks—your chance to elect the first woman President and brag that you knew me when.

When I only had one pair of socks.

Family Doctor of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, this week Dr. Katherine A. Chapman, of Kensington, Md., was named Family Doctor of the Year by the Maryland Academy of General Practice. The honor is well deserved by the modest, hard-working, and charming Dr. Chapman, who worked as a typist to defray the expenses of her medical studies.

Under permission to extend my remarks I wish to congratulate Dr. Chapman on receipt of this honor which recognizes her outstanding contribution to the community of Kensington. I also include an article from the October 17 edition of the Montgomery County (Md.) Sentinel giving the interesting background of this outstanding citizen.

The article written by Sentinel Reporter Vickie Van Pelt is as follows:

FAMILY DOCTOR OF THE YEAR IS RESIDENT OF KENSINGTON

(By Vicki Van Pelt)

A charming, gray-haired woman, who rose from the position of a War Department typist to a medical doctor was named Family Doctor of the Year this week by the Maryland Academy of General Practice.

The honor went to Dr. Katherine A. Chapman, who began practicing medicine in an office in her home in Kensington in 1926.

Dr. Chapman, known as "Dockie" to generations of patients, was born in Washington in 1901 and moved to Kensington with her family when she was still an infant. She attended Sidwell Friends High School in Washington and received her M.D. from George Washington University Medical School.

Cited by her friends as "modest and hard working," Dr. Chapman looks back with delight to the days when some patients called on Dr. A. K. Chapman, not knowing a woman would respond.

She also remembers "when I entered GW a month after the term had started," and spent many weary hours making up the work. She continued to work for 2 years as a typist for 3 days a week sandwiching in her medical studies during the remainder of the week.

The petite physician, for 2½ years during her early practice, was examining physician at the Washington chapter of the Young Women's Christian Association.

She has served as examining physician at George Washington Hospital for 10 years and spearheaded several health and education projects. From 1936 to the present she has been examining physician at the University of Maryland.

In addition to being a member of the Maryland Academy of General Practice, Dr. Chapman belongs to the American Medical Association, the Women's Medical Society of Maryland, the District Medical Society, the George Washington Medical Society and the Montgomery County Medical Society of which she is past president, past secretary, and the present historian.

Although busy at her profession, Dr. Chapman finds time to be an active member of the Kensington Chamber of Commerce.

She collects miniatures, does crossword puzzles while listening with rapt attention at a business meeting and says, "I really enjoy medical meetings and traveling especially if at the end of my travels there's a medical convention."

If she could turn back the calendar to 1922 would she be a doctor again? "This I can definitely answer in the affirmative," she added.

Hon. Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished career of Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, ended May 31 of this year, when he died at the age of 69. Those of us who knew Congressman Walter most intimately lost a great and dear friend and the